DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 444 427 HE 033 162

AUTHOR	Schoorman, Dilys
TITLE	Internationalization: The Challenge of Implementing Organizational Rhetoric.
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	34p.; For another paper on internationalization by this author, see HE 033 161.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; Case Studies; College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; *Foreign Students; Global Approach; *Graduate Students; Higher Education; Institutional Environment; *Institutional Mission; *International Educational Exchange; Interviews; Organizational Objectives; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Program Implementation
IDENTIFIERS	*Internationalism

ABSTRACT

This case study investigated the impact of an institutional mission to internationalize on the daily educational experiences of higher education faculty and students. A secondary purpose of the study was to investigate the role of international students in the internationalization process. The study was conducted in two selected departments of a large Midwestern university in which the administrative mission to internationalize had been institutionalized for five years. Data was gathered through interviews with 4 administrators, 6 faculty, and 12 foreign graduate students and from institutional strategic plan documents. Responses were coded according to three categories: participants' perceptions of the mission to internationalize, descriptions of daily experiences, and perceptions of the role played by international students in the educational process. Comparative analysis revealed disjunctions at three levels between articulated institutional goals and implementation at the departmental level; these were: perceived importance of internalization to all academic fields, desired scope of internationalization, and perceived role of international students. The paper concludes with several recommendations for implementing internationalization, noting that internationalization must be undertaken as a comprehensive university-wide effort, that it must be adopted as part of the on-going "normal" process of education, and that feedback between hierarchical organizational levels is necessary. (Contains 42 references.) (CH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 444 427

Internationalization: The challenge of implementing organizational rhetoric

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Schoorman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Dilys Schoorman
Department of Teacher Education
Florida Atlantic University
777 Glades Road
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Telephone: (561) 367-3003
E-mail: dschoorm@fau.edu

HE033162

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Internationalization: The challenge of implementing organizational rhetoric

Abstract

This study explores the impact of the university administrative mission to internationalize on two departments. Through the juxtaposition of administrative, faculty and student perspectives this paper reveals that internationalization is both understood and implemented in diverse ways by individuals and across departments and that there are discrepancies between the rhetoric of internationalization and its implementation.

INTERNATIONALIZATION: THE CHALLENGE OF IMPLEMENTING ORGANIZATIONAL RHETORIC

Introduction

"Internationalization" may well be the 'buzzword' of higher education in the 1990s. Few colleges have remained untouched by the recent need to internationalize. As Carroll (1993) points out, "Practically every college and university has the word 'international' in its mission statement" (p. 15). Despite the growing popularity of internationalization as a process of educational reform, it has remained on the periphery of educational practice (Lambert, 1989; 1995; Lyman, 1995; Van de Water, 1991). This gap between the rhetoric that endorses internationalization and its implementation can be attributed, in part, to the ambiguity of the term even among educators who value its implied worth (Goodwin Nacht, 1983; Henson, Noel, Gillard-Byers & Ingle, 1990; Smith 1994). As Arum and Van de Water (1992) point out, "We use the term more and more and seem to pay less and less attention to what it means" (p. 191). The positive connotations typically associated with such a term have also made "lip service to the need for change all but universal" but have precluded serious discussion of its educational implications (Lyman, 1995, p. 3). Smith (1994) noted that, "While the need for global and international studies is generally accepted, there is no agreement as to what it means, or how this can be implemented" (p. 17).

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of organizational rhetoric with regard to internationalization on the daily educational experiences of faculty and students in two selected departments. This study was conducted in a large midwestern university ("The University") in which the administrative mission to internationalize had been formally institutionalized five years previously. Of specific interest was manner in which faculty members and students at the level of the department understood and, in turn, implemented the administrative mission to internationalize. A secondary purpose of this study was the investigation of the role of international

students in the internationalization process. The role of students was examined through the juxtaposition of the rhetorical definition of such a role with its enactment in daily experiences. Three research questions guided this study: a) What is the nature and scope of internationalization as defined by diverse members of The University? b) What is the nature and scope of internationalization as implemented in the daily experiences of diverse members of The University? c) What is the role of international students in diverse members' definitions and implementation of internationalization?

Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by a conceptualization of internationalization that is grounded in two theoretical perspectives: systems theory of organization (Katz & Kahn, 1978) and critical pedagogy (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991; Giroux, 1992; Giroux & McLaren, 1989; 1994; Nieto, 1992). Systems theory provides a perspective of the university as a "complex set of interdependent parts that interact to adapt to the constantly changing environment to achieve its goal" (Kreps, 1990, p. 24). As such, internationalization is viewed as an ongoing organizational process that facilitates the fulfillment of educational goals commensurate with The University's role in a changing global context. Critical pedagogy endorses the goal of internationalization, emphasizing a) the need for multiple cultural perspectives to be represented in the curriculum, b) the value of the presence of cultural diversity among members of the university community, and c) the local and global implications of the internationalization process. The combination of these two theoretical perspectives frame the definition of internationalization that guided this study. *Internationalization is an ongoing, counter-hegemonic educational process that occurs in an international context of knowledge and practice where societies are viewed as subsystems of a larger, inclusive world. The process of internationalization at an educational institution entails a comprehensive, multifaceted program of action that integrates all aspects of education.* Three facets of this

definition will be explored in this paper: internationalization as comprehensive, internationalization as an ongoing process, and internationalization as counter-hegemonic.

Internationalization as comprehensive

Internationalization as comprehensive focuses on the need for internationalization to be conceptualized as an organization-wide process that involves all members regardless of their organizational roles or departmental affiliations. This conceptual feature is derived from systems theory's principle of interdependence. Interdependence implies that "all system parts are dependent on one another in the performance of organizational activities" (Kreps, 1990, p. 94). If all system parts are interdependent in the organizational process, it follows that internationalization as an organizational process is comprehensive.

Although the mission to internationalize is typically institutionalized by administrators, its implementation entails the interdependence of administrators, faculty members and students. While international educators agree that faculty members are crucial to the process of internationalization at a higher education institution they have also stressed the importance of international students in the internationalization process (Carter, 1992; Goodwin & Nacht, 1991; Harari, 1992; Harari & Reiff, 1993; Kuhlman, 1992; Tonkin & Edwards, 1981). A view of international students as educational resources is supported by Aronowitz and Giroux (1991) who encourage teachers to "draw upon cultural resources that students bring to class" (p. 130). This paper will examine the manner in which the roles of faculty members and international students in the internationalization process are defined by diverse members of The University and the congruence between such perspectives and the participants' daily experiences.

Internationalization as an ongoing process

According to Katz and Kahn (1978), "Social organizations are flagrantly open systems in that the input of energies and the conversion of output into further energic input consist of transactions between the organization and its environment" (p. 20). Internationalization as an ongoing process draws attention to two features salient to the conceptualization offered in this definition: that is continuous, and that it is the throughput process by which inputs are converted into desired outputs (Cavusgil, 1993). Such a perspective emphasizes that internationalization is an active process and involves the ongoing adaptation to the global context of education. Unlike the perspective of Byrd (1993) who argued that universities were already internationalized, internationalization as ongoing acknowledges achievements of the past, while focusing attention on future goals for internationalization. As an ongoing, adaptive process, internationalization also entails constant goal setting, implementation and evaluation. Such a perspective precludes a view of internationalization as "just the latest fad in American higher education that will fade away once something else comes along" (Carroll, 1993, p. 15).

Internationalization as counter-hegemonic

Critical pedagogy frames the process of internationalization as counter-hegemonic praxis, thereby making explicit the purpose of internationalization as well as the manner in which it should be implemented. Internationalization as counter-hegemonic operates on three dimensions. First, internationalization as counter - hegemonic calls for the representation (that is not confined to tokenism) of international perspectives in the knowledge generated and in the organizational practices within the educational institution. Second, internationalization as counter-hegemonic entails a pedagogical process characterized by a variety of pedagogical styles and multidirectional, dialogic communication. Internationalization moves beyond the teacher dominated instructional practice, where students as viewed as passive listeners who 'receive' information from

the 'experts'. This is especially important in the context of diverse student populations where international students can be drawn on as educational resources. Finally, internationalization as counter-hegemonic pertains to the goals of the educational process. Central to this conceptualization is perspective of the global context in which the efforts to internationalize should be contextualized. The goals of internationalization should entail a social vision that values democracy and equality on a global scale, where all nations and people are viewed as members of the same system (see also Albrow, 1990; Calleja, 1995; Harding, 1993; Lynch, 1992) .

Methods

In order to examine the impact of the university-wide goal of internationalization on department-specific educational processes, the investigation was designed as an embedded dual case study (Moon, 1991; Stake, 1988; 1994; Yin, 1989). Each each 'case' (i.e. department) provided a context within which the participants' perspectives were framed; these perspectives were, in turn, embedded in the context of the university administration. The departments will be referred to by the names of their respective schools: the Department of Science and the Department of Business. They ranked third and sixth among all departments at The University in their enrollment of international graduate students.

Data was gathered through interviews with four administrators, six faculty members and 12 students, and from documents pertaining to the strategic plans for internationalization undertaken by The University and the two schools. The participants were selected through maximum variety sampling (Morse, 1994; Patton, 1994), a strategy of purposive sampling (Patton, 1990). Although maximum variety among the faculty members was sought on the dimensions of national origin, gender and area of specialization, the three faculty members in each department shared a common trait. In the Department of Science, each directed a multinational research group, and in the

Department of Business each had been responsible for the internationalization of curricula. Criteria that ensured maximum variety in the selection of students were area of specialization, gender, and number of years spent in the USA. All students were graduate students and represented one of two nation groups - - India and South Korea - - which account for the second and fourth highest represented nation groups within the international student population of The University.

Interview transcripts were coded according to three categories linked with the research questions: participants' perceptions of the mission to internationalize, descriptions of daily experiences, and perceptions of the role of international students in the educational process. A case record (Yin, 1989) for each participant was then created, in which interview data was grouped in three sections according to the coding categories. This formed the basis for a creation of a chain of evidence (Yin, 1989) which entailed, in chronological order, the analysis of data for emergent patterns of convergence and divergence a) across the data in each coding category on a participant case record b) across participants in each group (e.g. students; faculty) c) across groups within departmental context d) between departments and finally, e) between the departmental and broader university context. The patterns of convergence and divergence reported in the data emerged through the triangulation of data sources. The results reported in this paper highlight the patterns pertaining to the definitions and implementations of internationalization that emerged through the comparative analysis of the university-departmental contexts.

Results

The comparative analysis of perspectives on internationalization yielded several disjunctions between the desired goals of internationalization as articulated at the university and school levels, and the implementation of internationalization at the departmental level. The data revealed disjunctions on three dimensions: the perceived

importance of internationalization to all academic fields, the desired scope of internationalization, and the perceived role of international students in the internationalization process.

Importance of internationalization to all fields

The University's Operational Plan for internationalization emphasized the importance of internationalization to the general educational mission of the institution.

> As The University approaches the new century, it has become increasingly apparent that to remain a world class institution and to fulfill its mission, The University needs to more fully develop its international dimensions in all activities undertaken in pursuit of teaching, research, and service. [OP. p. 11].

Furthermore, faculty members were viewed as crucial to the internationalization process.

> In my mind the faculty is the key and the curriculum is the core of that. My perception is that the curriculum is the firmest ground on which to build any program whether it is international or any other initiative that the university wants. If you want it to last and be institutionalized, then I think it has to be institutionalized in the curriculum. [UAD 1; p 11]]

The Operational Plan for internationalization at the level of the university was based on the strategic plans that each school had created, underscoring the importance of internationalization in all discipline areas. Although both schools endorsed the internationalization mission, the plans of the School of Science and those of the School of Business differed in the perceived need for internationalization and in the identification of strategies for internationalization.

Science: inherently international.

The School of Science, while recognizing the potential for increased study abroad and international exchange opportunities, was represented in its strategic plan as being on the "cutting edge" of internationalization. As evident in the following statement, this position was linked to the perceived nature of the field of science. "Perhaps because of the inherent nature of the sciences, the School of Science is at the 'cutting edge' of internationalization at The University." [SOS; p. 17].

Despite this endorsement of the School of Science, and the university administrative intent that internationalization be a institution-wide undertaking, all faculty and student participants in the Department of Science were unaware of the university mission to internationalize. Although all participants agreed on the importance of internationalization, there was disagreement on the relevance of internationalization to the field. A dominant pattern that emerged from these perspectives was the link between the nature of science as inherently international and the lack of any need for active internationalization efforts; a perspective that was re-iterated in the strategic plan of the School of Science, by a departmental administrator, faculty members and students. The internationalization activities highlighted in the strategic plan were those that occurred in departments external to the school through foreign language and humanities requirements.

> The School of Science has long had the foresight to institute and maintain (foreign languages and humanities requirements). Because science has historically developed as an international endeavor there has always been the recognition that our students should be broadly educated. [SOS; 17]

However, with regard to curriculum development within the department, the strategic plan noted, "There is little need for directed internationalization." [SOS; p. 17]

These perspectives about the internationalization of curriculum presented in the strategic plan of the School of Science were endorsed by departmental administrators, faculty members and students as illustrated in the following interview excerpts.

> To some extent the curriculum is internationalized, as it always has been. Because science is not something that is country-specific. [Departmental administrator: ADS 1; p. 19]
>
> I don't see how science can be anything but international. It is impossible for it to be parochial. It would be totally arbitrary to try to internationalize something which is not cultural. Science is not cultural. [Faculty member: FS 1; p. 27]
>
> Science is universal. If I study here, it would be the same thing as back in my home country. There are different applications of this knowledge, but how far do you take that? [Student: SS 1; p. 40]

While the participants in the Department of Science viewed internationalization as an important university mission, many viewed the nature of science as precluding any active efforts within the department to facilitate such a mission. The notions that science was "inherently international", or "not cultural" supported such a perspective. On the other hand, the members of the Department of Business viewed internationalization as central to their field of study.

Business: inherently in need of internationalization.

In the context of Business, the nature of the field was viewed as the primary impetus for internationalization. Internationalization activities of the Department of Business were co-ordinated at the level of the school by The University's Center for International Business Education and Research (CIBER). This organizational unit was instituted under the sponsorship of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, with the objective of "[increasing and promoting] the nation's capacity for international understanding and economic enterprise through suitable international education and training" [p. 61]. The participants cited several factors of business education that had contributed to the priority given to internationalization: demand of corporate employers for graduates knowledgeable in international issues, accreditation

pressures, as well as the need to maintain the prestige of the department in order to draw students to the program.

> It's market-driven. Employers come. They're looking for students whose career paths will have some placement overseas. [FB 2; p. 76]
>
> Internationalization is driven first and foremost by student demand. Which is indirectly a function of employer demand. Secondarily, I would say the driver is the AACSB, the accreditation standards putting an emphasis on international dimensions. That coupled with the fact that other MBA programs are simply becoming more international. [FB 3; p. 81]

Although it was intended by administrators at The University that the mission of internationalization be pursued by departments in all fields of study, the data indicates that the importance of such a mission was perceived differently, and according to how participants viewed the nature of their fields. Similarly, participants differed in their perceptions of how internationalization should be implemented, and the desired scope of such efforts at the departmental level.

Desired scope

The scope of internationalization desired by university administrators was the integration of international perspectives into the 'mainstream' educational process.

> A school that was truly internationalized would no longer have the need to distinguish between those things that are domestic and those things that are international or foreign. It would have a curriculum that was, by definition, with multiple orientations and views. It would not be an "American" curriculum but rather, would have many voices and would have many perceptions built into it. What I mean by that is simply, it would be normal. [UAD 1; p. 4]

However, faculty participants represented divergent perspectives on the scope of internationalization that they desired. These perspectives differed on two general

dimensions: attitudes to current internationalization efforts, and perspectives of the need for future efforts. Divergence on these dimensions yielded four categories of perspectives on the scope of internationalization.

The first category was one in which the participants were supportive of the internationalization efforts, but perceived no need for further efforts.

> For us international is a support activity. It's probably correct to say that adding international content is a legitimate goal of a business school. But the question is do you do it above and beyond your basic concept of what you want to teach? ... We have enough courses and it's unlikely that we will develop anymore. [FB 1; p. 72; 75]

The satisfaction with the current status of internationalization was justified by the contextual reality of business education.

> We are not on the cutting edge. While there may be a desire on the part of the dean and maybe on the part of faculty members, the truth is, frankly, our faculty is not good enough. [FB 1; p. 73].

The second category of perspectives was one in which current internationalization efforts were endorsed but, where more were encouraged or desired.

> I am not aware of this office or this mission [internationalization], but I think it's definitely a good thing. ... We could do this by making faculty contacts in other countries, by encouraging travel for faculty and students, through student exchange. [FS 3; p. 33]

Another perspective that emerged within this category focused on the difficulty for future efforts in internationalization. While future efforts were desired they were also seen as unrealistic.

> Some schools can afford a MBA program that is for people who specialize in international issues. ... Do I see us moving in that direction? Resource-wise it would be tough. My students aren't as well-off as they are some of the other

places and as a school we don't have the resources. ... Will we ever reach a ten? No. But we're doing the best we can. [FB 2; p. 80]

The third category of responses included those that were not supportive of current efforts to internationalize, and who did not want to implement further efforts. It is to be noted that it was the administrative actions towards internationalization, rather than the idea itself, that was viewed with dissatisfaction.

I have very little sympathy for this cultural engineering. I think what the university should do is concentrate on raising standards not artificial enhancements of certain concepts. ... And not to appoint a bunch of people to act as a bunch of cultural police. ... The first thing I'd do is to close down Women's Studies and all other cultural and politically correct stuff and concentrate on improving the quality of science and intellectual activity. ... Internationalization doesn't need any defense. It's a consequence of high quality. But systems for internationalizing seem to me to be problematic. [FS 1; p. 26]

The fourth category of response pertained to perspectives that reflected dissatisfaction with current efforts and called for different efforts to be institutionalized. These perspectives were contextualized primarily in the Department of Business, and were shared by faculty members and students. Participants' responses to the administrative process of internationalization included the terms " a farce", and "window dressing". Students in the Department of Business noted the need for the internationalization of coursework at the doctoral level, although the school's internationalization plan did not include such efforts.

Not at all enough is being done about it. If you consider the whole body of literature in my area, I would say about five to ten percent of that would be dealing with the international. Even that percentage is generous. ... If we do ten cases, maybe with one

case we will talk about global implications or something. But it is a very low priority. [SB 6; p.91]

I think a dominant way of approaching internationalization is to take the basic concepts that you have in a domestic context and choose cases that are international rather than domestic. I think that is a pretty trivial extension of the core concepts that students are learning. ... There is a demand for doctoral students who can go out into the international marketplace and teach international courses. ...We're doing them (doctoral students) a disservice if we do not offer some kind of international courses at the doctoral level. [FB 3; p. 83, 85]

Despite the university administrators' assertion of the importance of faculty members in the internationalization process, faculty members differed in their commitment to ongoing pedagogical efforts and in their evaluations of current efforts. The role of faculty members in the internationalization efforts at the micro level of the classroom also entail their ability to draw on international students as educational resources. However, participants differed in their view of the actual and potential impact of these students.

Role of international students

According to The University's operational plan for internationalization, international students were deemed important to the internationalization process.

International students are a great asset to [The] University, particularly in its efforts to more fully internationalize teaching, research and service activities. [OP- 78; p. 5]

This purpose, with regard to informal interaction, was endorsed by university administrators. However, they also noted that the potential for such a purpose was fulfilled only to a limited degree.

One contribution that all international students make, whether they want to or not, is being here. The potential is there to draw from international students, for the domestic

> students to learn, to see many different cultures without leaving campus. ... Many of our students have come here in fact to have very little interaction with the wide community because of the nature of their studies. ... Some of them work in the laboratory and very rarely see the sunlight, let alone other people and therefore do not contribute much from their culture to ours. [UAD 1; p. 6]

Another administrator noted the potential of international students in the formal instructional setting.

> Some professors, not too many, have talked to me about how they use the students in the class to add certain perspectives that would not be there if the students weren't there. That's good. ...Knowledge doesn't have to come from this country. There are certain things we do in science that may not have originated in the US. ... Our students in the US can learn from these students how issues and concerns are handled in another culture. So the instructor may not be able to provide with accuracy some knowledge about another country, but students from that country could. [UAD 2; p. 7]

Participants in each department had diverse views on the potential of international students to contribute to the educational process. Although all participants viewed the presence of international students as positive, the specific impact of this presence was perceived differently. Three general perspectives emerged. Within the department of science, several participants (faculty and students) noted that the culture of students had no impact on the pedagogical process.

> I have spent most of my career working with a mixture of people whose genders, places of origin, and religions and everything are the most unimportant characteristic about them. ... The only difference it makes is culturally, rather than scientifically. ... I don't know that international people bring any more or less to the science than do the American [sic] students. [FS 1; p.28]

A second perspective focused on the advantages of the cultural diversity of students in the pedagogical process. This perspective was held by faculty participants in both Science and in Business.

> International students come with different perspectives, different ways of approaching [science] and it's good to have this diversity. ... I had an American [sic], a Chinese and a German collaborate on a project and I think they learned a different way of thinking, different approaches to the problem, they learned to interact with somebody who is used to interacting with scientists in an entirely different way. So I think they came out wiser and with much better interpersonal skills. [FS 3; p. 34]
>
> In the classroom they are some of the better students. They are bringing up the issues and driving some of the discussions. ... They teach the class. [FB 2; p. 77]

Another perspective on the impact of international students was in regard to their work ethic and academic preparation.

> I don't see foreign students as contributing because of their diverse cultural backgrounds, as they do more or less the same job, but because of their well prepared nature and their willingness to work hard. [FS 2; p. 30]
>
> My day is spent either in the lab or at home. I don't do anything else. [SS 4]
>
> It has become a tradition where you're expected to work hard because you are an international student. ... Do we really have a choice? If I start working on a 9-5 schedule everyday, will I get a PhD? Will I get a good recommendation from my boss to pursue other stuff after the PhD? [SS 1; p. 44]

Despite the fact that university-level administrators recognized the potential for the national diversity among students to contribute positively to the internationalization process, the data indicates that their potential as educational resources was realized only

when they were recognized as resources and had the opportunities to fulfill such expectations.

Discussion

The data presented revealed several disjunctions between administrative rhetoric and the department specific implementation of internationalization. Although internationalization had been framed by university and school administrators as relevant to all fields, and all participants agreed that internationalization was important to education, participants at the departmental level saw the nature of their specific academic field as the *raison d'être* for their active implementation of internationalization. Furthermore, although faculty members were viewed as crucial to the internationalization process, the data revealed that they had vastly divergent perspectives on the importance of and desired scope for internationalization. Finally, the data confirmed the conclusions of several international educators (Goodwin & Nacht, 1983; Lambert, 1995; Lyman, 1995; Tonkin & Edwards, 1981) that though the presence international students was deemed important by educators, the specific impact of this presence was yet unclear. Central to this discussion are the implications of these disjunctions to the implementation of internationalization as a comprehensive educational process within The University. The ideas presented are framed within the context of organizational rhetoric salient to the internationalization efforts of The University.

Being on the "cutting edge"

The term 'cutting edge' in the context of education, can be interpreted in several ways. On the one hand, it suggests leadership within a field that anticipates future educational needs. The School of Science, according to its strategic plan, was deemed to be on the "cutting edge of internationalization" and had reflected foresight in requiring foreign language and humanities competencies for its graduates. However, this attribution also

served to justify inaction within the field. Being on the cutting edge of internationalization precluded active efforts towards this goal because "science was international". On the other hand, a participant in the Department of Business noted the lack of any need for future internationalization efforts because the department was not on the cutting edge, and did not have the expertise to be there. For others, internationalization offered a means for the institution to have a competitive edge. At the university level, internationalization was framed as being integral to the university's teaching, research and service mission in order to remain a "world class" institution. In the context of the Department of Business, internationalization was a means of organizational survival in a competitive environment. Internationalization facilitated ongoing student enrollment, graduate placement, and prestige through accreditation. These perspectives underscore the need to examine the rhetoric of internationalization with its implications for organizational action. What does it mean to be on the cutting edge? Does the cutting edge entail the successful reaching of an end state, thereby precluding further action, or does it involve ongoing action towards an end?

Linked to this discussion of the "cutting edge" is the nature and function of the internationalization process itself. What were the desired goals of internationalization and how did they relate to the goals of the general education process? Although at the level of university administrators, internationalization was deemed integral to the teaching, research and service missions of the university, this perspective was not shared by research participants at the departmental level. In the context of Business, the goals of internationalization were integrally linked with the competitive survival of the department, rather than with its educational goals. A key implication of this perspective is that internationalization could be deemed important only to the extent that the competitiveness of the department was threatened. As Nehrt (1993) points out, such a perspective leads to internationalization at the MBA level but not at the doctoral level, because the requirements for accreditation calls for the former and not the latter. Within

the sciences, internationalization was seen by many as a process extraneous to education in the sciences, or as a goal already achieved. As such, the relevance of internationalization to the sciences becomes an issue, thereby limiting efforts towards implementation. If internationalization is to be implemented as a central facet of the university-wide educational process, it will be important for its relevance to be articulated across multiple organizational levels and in diverse academic fields.

Faculty members are key to internationalization

The role of faculty in internationalization has been emphasized by many educators. However, the data presented here reflected several weaknesses in eliciting faculty support towards internationalization. First, faculty members in the Department of Science were unaware of the mission to internationalize. Greater awareness among faculty will need to be generated if they are to be key players in the internationalization effort. The faculty participants in the Department of Business were aware of the mission to internationalize because they had been actively involved in the implementation of school-based efforts. On the other hand, the strategic plan of the School of Science, in asserting that science was inherently international, failed to include faculty members in the everyday implementation of internationalization.

Second, many faculty members' perspectives on internationalization were divergent from those of administrators. Many faculty members were skeptical of the motives of administrators who advocated internationalization or were dissatisfied with current efforts. This underscored the failure of administrators both to articulate organizational goals to faculty members, and to forge the link between such desired organizational agendas and those of the individual organizational members (Barnard, 1938/ 1968). If, as noted by The University administrators, faculty members are to be key players in the internationalization process, the discrepancies between the perspectives of administrators and faculty members need to be addressed. Faculty members will need to

recognize the value of internationalization to their daily work, and be encouraged, recognized, and rewarded for such efforts.

A third, related weakness was the directionality of information flow with regard to internationalization. The discrepancies between the perspectives of administrators and faculty members also reflected the lack of opportunity for faculty perspectives to be heard by administrators. Faculty members whose perspectives were not congruent with the school-based administrative view drew into focus questions about the relevance of internationalization to the field, and the rationale and scope of such efforts. These issues need to be discussed in a broader forum if greater faculty support for internationalization is desired.

The presence of international students is important

Although all participants endorsed the importance of the presence of international students on the campus, the manner in which they were perceived to impact the process of internationalization differed across participants. Hence, the specific benefits of international students' presence remained ambiguous. This ambiguity was evident in the lack of congruence between the perspective that international students were important and the assertion that the nationality of students made no difference in the educational process; or in the apparent contradiction of the statements that the students' culture had no impact on the scientific process, but that international students were more hardworking and intelligent. The multiple perspectives also bring into question the specific role that international students currently play in the educational process at The University, and the desired role of international students in the internationalization process.

The strategic plan of The University noted the importance of the presence of international students in terms of the informal cross cultural contact and awareness that they offered within the educational community. A university administrator also noted

that many international students were unable to fulfill this potential role because they preferred to spend their time in the laboratory. However, within the departmental context, the impact of international students was measured by faculty and student participants, in terms of their work ethic in the research laboratory. Furthermore, the students perceived that being hardworking in the laboratory was assumed of all international students. This raises the question as to whether the inability of students to interact within the community was a choice of the students, or merely a reality of the departmental context within which they are placed. As long as students perceived the need to spend prolonged hours within the research laboratory, it was unlikely that the university objectives desired from their presence within the community would be realized.

A second problem revealed is the fact that a key university administrator defined the role of international students in terms of their informal contact with others within the academic community. The presence of diversity was deemed an adequate outcome of the enrollment of international students. However participants at the departmental level noted a wider impact of the presence of international students - in terms of their contributions to learning in both the research laboratory and in the classroom. The educational impact of international students in the classroom and laboratory is especially important in the current context of internationalization at The University. Given that the process is relatively new, and, as noted by several participants, faculty expertise in the area of international issues is limited, international students could serve an in-house resources in the internationalization of teaching and research actitivities.

However, students' ability to fulfill this role will be dependent on the faculty members with whom they work. First, faculty members will have to recognize the potential of students' contribution. Second they will have to create opportunities for such a contribution to be made. Those faculty members who recognized the contribution of international students as educational resources within the classroom also pointed out that

they adopted a facilitative style of teaching. Perhaps the role of international students as educational resources should be linked to faculty members' roles in facilitating such an impact. Currently the role of faculty members in the internationalization process is limited to that of a curriculum developer. Their role as instructors and advisors could be crucial to enhancing potential role of international students in the internationalization process.

Recommendations

The discussion of the findings focused on the weaknesses of the internationalization process that emerged through the juxtaposition of diverse perspectives included in this study. The focus of this section will be on how the strengths inherent in the organizational rhetoric can be borne out in action within the organization. Furthermore, the recommendations suggested will also underscore the need for continued feedback between the multiple hierarchical levels within the organizational context in order that the organizational synergy generated through an interdependent implementation of internationalization will realize the fullest potential of such a process.

Internationalization: a comprehensive effort

The intentions of the administrators at The University in involving all schools and departments in the internationalization process were appropriate. If internationalization is to be undertaken as a comprehensive, university-wide effort it is apt that department- and school-specific participation in the planning is elicited. However, the examination of the school-based strategic plans and the perspectives of participants revealed that the commitment to such a process was not university-wide and that the perceived salience of their academic field was a significant factor in participants' attitudes towards internationalization.

This underscores the need for increased department-specific or school-specific leadership in generating a commitment towards internationalization. As had occurred in the context of the Department of Business such leadership would facilitate organizational awareness of the importance of internationalization to the field, would be responsible for the development and implementation of a comprehensive strategy for internationalization for their organizational unit and would draw on faculty members supportive of such a priority to initiate departmental efforts. Such support was present in both departments yet, as evident in the data, faculty participants' diverse perspectives on internationalization had not been adequately represented at the administrative level.

In addition to generating a field-specific impetus for internationalization, departmental leaders will also need to facilitate the process of internationalization beyond rhetoric that pays lip service to such ideas, to specific implementation efforts. Such implementation would be based on the examination of the relationship between internationalization and being on the "cutting edge" of the specific field of education. However, internationalization should not be confined to field-specific criteria. The weakness of such a perspective was evident in the Department of Business where the efforts of internationalization were limited to pragmatic issues of employment opportunities or accreditation. Both departmental and university leaders need to underscore the educational (rather than only the professional), interpersonal and civic purposes of internationalization (Schechter, 1993). Organization members' participation in internationalization efforts should enable the answering of each of the following questions. How does internationalization enhance one's knowledge bases? How does internationalization enhance one's attitude to difference? How does internationalization prepare students for living as responsible citizens in a global village?

Internationalization as "normal"

It was the desire of a senior administrator at The University that internationalization be adopted as a "normal" process of education. This perspective has been articulated by several educators who call for internationalization to move beyond its peripheral position into the mainstream of education (Harari & Reiff, 1993; Lambert, 1989; 1995; Lyman, 1995; Van de Water, 1991). Currently, there are several obstacles to achieving this goal. First, the perception that internationalization is a politically correct fad needs to be dismissed. Faculty members who subscribe to this perception will need to be persuaded that the attempts to internationalize are, in fact, genuine. The current gaps between the rhetoric of internationalization and its implementation will only contribute to suspiciousness of the process. Second, the perception that internationalization consists primarily of curricular "additives" reduces it to a mathematical process. While the addition of specific international courses have contributed to the increased awareness of international issues, they are not the only means for internationalization. As noted by several faculty members, the awareness that students bring in unique cross cultural expertise into the classroom, could facilitate internationalization in a context where the written curriculum was not intended to be so. Faculty members and students will need to begin to recognize opportunities to engage in internationalization in their daily experiences.

A third obstacle to internationalization being "normal" is the fact that internationalization was not deemed an integral facet of the faculty reward system (see Goodwin & Nacht, 1991), nor was it part of the normal educational experience of students (see Lambert, 1989; Nehrt, 1993). Although The University offered faculty members nominal grants for curriculum development and international travel, these only sustained efforts of faculty members who were able to integrate already established international interests into their teaching and research. For these faculty members internationalization was possible to the extent that such interests did not interfere with

their progress towards their promotion and tenure. For students, internationalization was not a "normal" facet of education. Apart from a foreign language requirement for students in the sciences, the level of international awareness guaranteed all graduates was minimal. In the context of business education, international awareness was generated primarily through international "components" in the entry level masters courses. The more focused curriculum development efforts comprised electives, allowing for international awareness among students to be "normal" only to those who chose to want it.

The ability to make internationalization a "normal" facet of the curriculum is also limited by faculty expertise. International educators have identified several steps that could serve to overcome this challenge: the hiring of faculty with specific international expertise, the creation of opportunities for faculty members to gain international expertise through foreign travel, co-operative curriculum development efforts, workshops and learning opportunities, work incentives for internationalization efforts, and the hosting of international scholars (Goodwin & Nacht, 1991; Tonkin & Edwards, 1981).

Internationalization as an ongoing process

For several of the participants in this study, internationalization was a goal that had already been achieved. For others, it was a goal yet to be achieved. This distinction in perspectives is not unusual in discussions of internationalization (see Byrd, 1993). However, if internationalization is to be viewed as integral to the teaching, research and service missions of The University, which are inevitably ongoing, it is essential that internationalization also be viewed as an ongoing process.

As an ongoing process, internationalization entails the constant monitoring of and adaptation to the changing needs and demands of the global and local context. This is best achieved by a systematic strategic planning process for internationalization which will include the identification of local and global changes and their educational implications, the development of both short-term and long-term goals, the formulation of specific

implementation strategies that would fulfill the goals, and the evaluation of short term and long term efforts.

The current efforts in internationalization at The University were linked to local and professional needs. They represent a significant initial effort in the internationalization process. Subsequent efforts will need to address the global impact of internationalization as practiced in The University. For instance, if the presence of international students was important at the local, institutional level, what was the significance of their sojourn in the USA at a global level? Many of these students will return to their countries and, as Ph.D.s, will engage in the process of education in their countries. As Tonkin and Edwards (1981) insightfully probe, is international education, as currently practiced, a means of internationalization the US education system, or is it a means for 'Americanizing' a global system? Schechter (1993) points out the need for the goals of internationalization to be defined in terms beyond the immediate, pragmatic, professional parameters, to include the social and civic purposes of internationalization. Nevertheless, these purposes should not be viewed as separate, but rather as integrally linked with one another. The internationalization efforts undertaken within any academic context should entail the preparation of students to be responsible and successful as professionals and as citizens in a global world (Calleja, 1995; Harding, 1995; Lynch, 1992).

According to Schechter (1993), "An institution must be able to gauge how far it has gone *and how far it still has to go*" (p. 130; emphasis added). This can be achieved through the identification of both short-term (e.g. to be achieved within a year) and long-term goals (e.g. to be achieved over a five or ten year period), and the ongoing evaluation of progress. The short-term goals, when fulfilled, will provide the institution with information on how much progress has been made, while long-term goals identify future or ongoing efforts. However, care must also be taken to identify those aspects of internationalization that occur at the micro level of education, that are often excluded from

goal statements or evaluation. For instance, the internationalization efforts entailed in the everyday pedagogical process were absent from official documents pertaining to internationalization. Yet, such interactions could yield significant international awareness among students. On the other hand, a curriculum drawn up to include "international components" would be acknowledged as a facet of internationalization. Furthermore, evaluation of internationalization should not be limited to 'progress reports' that merely identify success. Schechter (1993) emphasizes the importance of admitting mistakes and sharing them with others. However, this can only be done in a climate within which internationalization is no longer viewed with suspicion or skepticism. Ideally, the feedback process should facilitate open communication among colleagues and between organizational levels in order to assess current process and future directions.

Summary

This study was undertaken to examine the impact of the mission to internationalize on the everyday experiences of faculty members and students among whom such an administrative goal is implemented. Data was gathered from three organizational levels and was analyzed from two perspectives: what was said about internationalization and what was done about internationalization. Through the juxtaposition of administrative perspectives evident in the strategic plans for internationalization and supported through interviews with selected administrators, with the perspectives of faculty members and students, this study revealed that a) despite the widespread endorsement of internationalization as important, its implementation was limited, b)there was considerable divergence in perspectives between the organizational levels about the nature and scope of internationalization, c) there was a lack of congruence among members of the same organizational level about the nature and scope of internationalization and d) despite the unanimous agreement that the presence of international students was beneficial, their specific impact remained ambiguous and

thereby they were underutilized as educational resources in the process of internationalization. These findings underscore the complexity of internationalization as a concept, and as an organizational process. It is hoped that the focus on the diverse perspectives of organizational members will facilitate ongoing discussion among educators on where they are and where they hope to be as professionals and citizens in a global context.

References

Albrow, M. (1990). Introduction. In M. Albrow & E. King. (Eds.). *Globalization, Knowledge and Society.* (pp. 3-13). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Aronowitz, S. & Giroux, H. A. (1991). Postmodern education: Politics, culture and social criticism. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Arpan, J. (1993). Curricular and administrative considerations - the Cheshire cat parable. In T. Cavusgil (Ed.), Internationalizing Business Education: Meeting the challenge. (pp. 15-29). Lansing, MI: Michigan State Univ.

Arum, S. & Van de Water, J. (1992). The need for a definition of international education in U.S. universities. In C. Klasek, (ed.). Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing Higher Education. (pp. 191-203). Carbondale, Ill.: Association of International Education Administrators.

Bailey, K. M., Pialorsi, F. & Zukowski/Faust, J. (Eds.). (1984). Foreign teaching assistants in U.S. universities. Washington D.C.: NAFSA

Byrd, P. (1993). Halfway there? We crossed the bridge long ago! International Educator, 3, (1), p. 18.

Calleja, J. (1995). International Education: A common direction for our future. In J. Calleja (Ed.). *International Education and the University.* (pp. 41-57). London: Jessica Kingsley.

Carter, H. M. (1992). Implementation of international competence strategies: Faculty. In C. B. Klasek, (Ed.). *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education.* (pp. 39- 51). Carbondale, IL: Assoc. International Education Administrators.

Carroll, B. (1993). Why internationalize? Why now? *International Educator, 3,* (1), p. 15.

Cavusgil, S. T. (1993). *Internationalizing Business Education: Meeting the challenge.* East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Cotten, C. (1994) U.S. Universities are a melting pot for the world's best talent. *International Educator, IV,* (1), 2-3.

Dunnett, S. C. (1981). Introduction. In M. Y. Lee, M. Abd-Ella, & L. A. Burks, (1981). *Needs of foreign students from developing nations at U.S. colleges and universities.* Washington DC.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. pp. x-xvi.

Fox, W. & Gay, G. (1994). Functions and effects of International Teaching Assistants. *Review of Higher Education, 18,* 1-24.

Fullinwider, R. (1994). Global education and controversy: Some observations. In J. Fonte & A Ryerson, (Eds.). *Education for America's role in world affairs.* (pp. 23-30). Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.

Giroux, H. (1989). Schooling as a form of cultural politics: Towards a pedagogy of and for difference. In H. Giroux & P. McLaren (Eds.). (1989). *Critical pedagogy, the state, and cultural struggle.* (pp. 125-151). Albany: SUNY.

Giroux, H. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education.* New York: Routledge.

Giroux, H. & McLaren, P. (Eds.). (1989). *Critical pedagogy, the state, and cultural struggle.* Albany: SUNY.

Giroux, H. & McLaren, P. (Eds.). (1994). *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies.* New York: Routledge.

Goodwin, C. D. & Nacht, M. (1983). *Absence of decision: Foreign students in American colleges and universities.* New York: Institute of International Education.

Goodwin, C. D. & Nacht, M. (1991). *Missing the boat: The failure to internationalize American Higher Education.* New York: Cambridge.

Harari, M. (1992). The internationalization of curriculum. In C. B. Klasek, (Ed.). *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education.* (pp. 52- 79). Carbondale, IL: Assoc. International Education Administrators.

Harari, M. & Reiff, R. F. (1993). Halfway there: A view from the bridge. International *Educator, 3*, (1), pp. 16-19+.

Harding, S. (1993). Introduction: Eurocentric scientific illiteracy - a challenge for the world community. In S. Harding, (Ed.). *The racial economy of science: Toward a democratic future.* (pp. 1-29). Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press.

Hayward, F. M. (1995). International opportunities and challenges for American Higher education in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. In K. H. Hanson & J. W. Meyerson, (Eds.), *International challenges to American colleges and universities: Looking ahead.* (pp. 117-140). Phoenix: Oryx.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations.* New York: Wiley & Sons.

Klasek, C. B. (Ed.). (1992). *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing Higher Education.* Carbondale, Ill.: Association of International Education Administrators.

Kreps, G. (1990) *Organizational Communication.* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Kuhlman, A. (1992). International students and scholars. In C. M. Klasek, (Ed.). *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing Higher Education.* (pp. 22- 38). Carbondale, Ill.: Association of International Education Administrators.

Lambert, R. D. (1989). *International studies and the undergraduate.* Washington DC.: American Council on Education

Lambert, R. D. (1995). Foreign student flows and the internationalization of higher education. In K. H. Hanson & J. W. Meyerson, (Eds.), *International challenges to American colleges and universities: Looking ahead.* (pp. 18-41). Phoenix: Oryx.

Lyman, R. (1995) Overview. In K. H. Hanson & J. W. Meyerson, (Eds.), *International challenges to American colleges and universities: Looking ahead.* (pp. 1-17). Phoenix: Oryx.

Lynch, J. (1992). *Education for citizenship in a multicultural society.* London: Falmer Press.

Marion, P. B. (1986). Research on foreign students at colleges and universities in the United States. In K. R. Pyle (Ed.), *Guiding the development of foreign students* (pp. 65-82). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Moon, S. M. (1991). Case study research in gifted education. In N.K. Buchanan & J. F. Feldhusen, (Eds.), Conducting research and evaluation in gifted education. (pp. 157-178). New York: Teachers College Press.

National Center for Educational Statistics (1995). *Digest of Educational Statistics.* U.S. Department of Educational Resources and Improvement.

Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* New York: Longman.

Rahman, T. & Kopp, L. (1992). Administration of International Education. In C. Klasek, (ed.). *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education.* (pp. 1-22). Carbondale, IL: Association of International Educators.

Schechter, M. (1993). Internationalizingg the university and building bridges across disciplines. In T. Cavusgil (Ed.), *Internationalizing Business Education: Meeting the challenge.* (pp.129-140). Lansing, MI: Michigan State Univ.

Smith, A. F. (1994). A brief history of pre-collegiate global and international studies education. In J. Fonte, & A. Ryerson, (Eds.). *Education for America's role in world affairs.* (pp. 1-21). Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.

Stake, R. E. (1994). Case Studies. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* . (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (1988). Case study methods in educational research: Seeking sweet water. In R. M. Jaeger (Ed.), Complementary methods for research in education (pp. 253-269). Washington DC.: American Education Research Association.